

Uncle Sam can "forward, march," without his order. That is the man who occupies the presidency, and when one is lifted by his countrymen to this supreme pinnacle of power he ought to be in position to serve them with singleness of purpose; he ought to tear from his breast every shred of ambition and on his bended knees consecrate four years to his country's service with no selfish interests to blind his eyes or pervert his judgment.

But, my friends, that is not all. If he is a candidate he must compare his record as a progressive with the record of the progressive democrat who will be named against him, and when he does that he will fail.

I appreciate what Mr. Roosevelt has done in educating the people on some subjects. No man could feel more grateful to him than I, because he has made so many of my ideas "respectable" here in the east. On one or two questions he has gone beyond me and made me seem conservative by contrast. He is for the election of senators by the people now; I am glad of it, but the democratic party began fighting for it eighteen years before he ever expressed an opinion on the subject. He was president seven years and a half, yet he never recommended it, although Andrew Johnson, forty years before him, did; so he has not caught up with Andrew Johnson yet and did not during his administration. He advocated legislation on certain railroad questions, yes; but not until after three democratic platforms had demanded it; and so you can take up these various questions and you will find that democrats began to fight for them long before he did.

He tells you now that there is "a subsidized press." I could have told him that sixteen years ago if he had only consulted me about it.

He says that there is "a money power." Why, my friends, we have known it, and as one who in three campaigns led the people in their fight against the money power, I can testify that he not only did not help, but that he was on the other side. Every honor he has won has been won with the aid of the money power which he now denounces. Did he know then what he knows now? If so, why was he silent then? Has he just found it out? If so, he ought to feel humiliated to think he had not discovered it sooner and give praise to the democrats who saw it when he did not.

Our party's hope for the future depends on two grounds: first, growth of democratic ideas, and, second, dissension in the republican party. I never saw the republican party divided to suit me before; never saw it split through the middle with a president leading one side and an ex-president leading the other.

And yet, my friends, we can not rely upon dissension. We can not afford to throw our chances away by making a mistake. My interest in the Baltimore convention is not in candidates; we are rich in candidates. I glory in the fact that we have had an opportunity to develop men who have proven that they are worthy to be trusted in this high office. We have not only the few candidates gathered here, but we have dozens of men who are worthy of consideration in connection with this office. But, my friends, let not those who go to Baltimore mistake the conditions that surround us. The democratic party can win. How? By deserving to win. The democratic party can not retreat and win. The democratic party can not let the exploiters of this country select its candidates. J. Pierpont Morgan made sixty-nine millions by organizing the steel trust: I, for one, protest against his selecting the democratic candidate for president. James J. Hill organized a merger which was declared by the supreme court a violation of the criminal law. I protest against his selecting the democratic candidate. The men who use government as a private asset and have no politics except to support the party that will turn the people over to them for plunder, these men can not lead the democratic party in a successful campaign.

My friends, this is a splendid banquet. The people gathered here are prosperous looking, but you can not gauge a country by a banquet of this kind. I remind you that while J. Pierpont Morgan was making sixty-nine millions by organizing one conspiracy against ninety millions of people, little children in Lawrence, Massachusetts, were paying five cents a week for the water they had to drink, while they worked for starvation wages.

Which side of this question is the democratic party going to take? It is all well to talk about harmony, but harmony is good only when the party marches forward together. Harmony is a curse if, to get it, we must betray

the hopes of the people and be recreant to a trust.

If I have spoken with earnestness, remember I have been in a position to know more about what is going on than some of you for I have travelled over this country enough to learn the sentiment of the mass of the people. Be not deceived when they tell you that "it is all over but the shouting." Did not the republican party win by a big majority in 1908? And did we not, two years afterward, carry congress by a majority of over fifty. Why this change? Because the republican party betrayed those who voted the republican ticket. If in the republican party there is a progressive sentiment that numbers fully one half of its voters, do you doubt that the progressive sentiment among the democratic party is larger than that? Take the past as a teacher. The predatory interests tried, four years ago, to prevent my nomination. I had no organization, I had nearly every big paper against me and yet without money or organization I was nominated for a third time and I had over nine-tenths of the delegates of that convention. Do you think I could have had it unless the democrats were progressive? Have they changed since then? Be not deceived by these papers that attempt to mislead you as to what the people think. I can speak of my own experience because when I was a candidate I thought that I could poll more votes than any other democrat who aspired to the office. It is needless now to consider whether it was true or not. If I were a candidate it would be a question worthy of consideration, but I think there are, today, many democrats who can poll more votes than I can and, instead of being sorry, I rejoice, I glory in the growth of these new men. When I thought I could poll the most votes I was willing to be your candidate; when I made up my mind that there are others who can do better I am not a candidate. You think I fought for myself? Give me a chance to fight for a progressive and see how much better I can fight. That is all I ask. When you thought I had a selfish ambition you might have condemned me. You can not condemn me now when I ask only a chance to serve my country as a private citizen. When I was handicapped by the charge that I had a selfish interest to serve I was unsuccessful; God grant that my services may be worth more and that my speeches may be more effective when I am relieved of the suspicion of a selfish interest. But because I am not a candidate, do not for a moment think that I am out of politics or shall be; I shall be in politics while I live and while I live the democratic party will never be surrendered to Wall street until I have protested—protested until the vote has been counted. There is more independence in this country today than there ever was before and on next November, election day, there will be more men, republicans and democrats both, who will forget all about party and vote to save this country for the people of the country than there ever were before. And when they do it they will pay the highest tribute that they can pay to men like Jefferson and Lincoln. Both of these were party men but with them parties were means to an end. If they had not put their country above their party they would not have been loved as they are, nor would they have had the influence that they then had and still have.

These may not be pleasant thoughts for an occasion like this, but, my friends, if they are not pleasant to you let me remind you that as one who three times bore the banner and led six millions and a half of democrats I would not be worthy of the support they gave me and the affection they showered upon me if I was not willing to plead their cause in this city, where the concentration of wealth surpasses the ambitions of the average man.

#### NOW MR. TAFT TAKES ONE

In a speech delivered April 29th in Massachusetts, Mr. Taft suggested an amendment to the constitution providing that the president should serve six or eight years and be ineligible to re-election.

Mr. Roosevelt has taken so many of Mr. Bryan's doctrines that Mr. Taft is to be pardoned for laying hands on one or two. In his letter accepting the democratic nomination in 1896 Mr. Bryan announced that if elected he would not be a candidate for a second term. That was in harmony with Mr. Bryan's efforts for a constitutional amendment making the president ineligible for a second term. During the Fifty-third congress Mr. Bryan introduced a resolution providing for the submission of such an amendment. The committee reported the meas-

ure favorably but congress refused to give it consideration. Since then Mr. Bryan has repeatedly urged the adoption of an amendment limiting the presidential term to a period of six years and making the president ineligible to a second term.

#### PRACTICAL TARIFF TALKS

The protest voiced by the Roosevelt supporters because Senator Guggenheim used strong-arm methods in securing the Colorado delegation for Taft failed to take into consideration the fact that the senator was under great obligations to the administration, and it was but right that he should pay those obligations. The name of Guggenheim instantly brings to mind the smelter trust, a philanthropic organization devised by the Guggenheim family for lightening the load of wealth western mine-owners would otherwise be compelled to carry. Senator Simon is its political representative, and a casual inspection of the lead schedule of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, which Mr. Taft pronounced the best ever passed, will give a fairly clear idea of why Senator Simon took no chances on getting other than a Taft delegation from his state.

When the lead schedule was under consideration by the senate committee on finance Senator Aldrich said that he did not desire to hear from the lead manufacturers for the reason that he was convinced that because they were consumers of lead they would want the tariff reduced, and this he construed to be an attack upon American industry. The lead business is one of the big industries of the country, due to the many and varied uses the product may be put. Lead is extracted from an ore that is found in large deposits in several sections of the country. Down in Mexico there are lead mines of equal richness, and to protect the American mine owner from the competition of the Mexican ores a duty of \$30 a ton, or 1½ cents a pound is levied. After the lead ore is extracted from the mine it is put through a concentrator—unless, perchance, it is a sulphide ore—a process that is utilized to eliminate non-containing rock for the purpose of saving freight. From there the lead goes to the smelter.

The American Smelting and Refining company is the largest smelter of lead and copper ores in the country. It dominates the business. The process is interesting, but not very expensive. The price runs from \$7 to \$8 a ton. And what do you suppose the tariff is? The differential between lead ore and the refined products, a tariff levied to protect the smelter men, is \$12.50 a ton. In other words, in order to protect the smelting industry from competition, the tariff differential is \$4.50 to \$5.50 a ton more than the total cost of the smelting. And most of the lead contains silver. In order to make more secure the position of the smelter trust the tariff schedules are so drawn that the smaller smelters can not handle any of the foreign ores.

Before the house ways and means committee, when the present tariff law was being made, representatives of the lead manufacturers appeared and stated that if lead ore were placed on the free list, they would be glad to consent to having all duties taken off their product. Here is an extract from the testimony of M. L. Lissberger, owner of a smelter and refinery near New York city, who also represented fifty-one manufacturers of lead goods:

"The lead manufacturers believe in protection, but they say that if you will give them free lead they are willing to have free trade on their manufactured goods. That is because they have the best workmen in the world, and they can turn out more per dollar day than any other; and even as it is, with all the expense added of bringing over foreign lead they can and do sell their goods in foreign countries. Free trade in lead ore would not mean that they would get their lead from abroad, but we do expect that our American miners will begin to stop paying the amounts they are now paying (for smelting costs) and that we will begin to treat lead as other metals are treated, without that great, big rake-off for certain smelting interests or all smelting interests."

But the lead schedule was left unimpaired, with all of its big rake-off for the smelting interests, and with all of the unnecessary costs passed onto the consumer. Senator Guggenheim is no ingrate. C. Q. D.